

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

None

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS/DISCUSSION:**REMARKS/DISCUSSION:**

This Amendment is being filed within two months after the shortened period of response, which ended on January 19, 2005. A Petition for a Two-Month Extension of Time accompanies this Amendment A.

Claims 18-28 remain pending in this application. Claims 18 and 24 have been amended. Support for the amendment may be found at page 9, lines 22-25 and Figs. 1-5.

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action. This Amendment is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 18-22 and 24-27 stand rejected as being anticipated by Olympus Optical in JP 8275952 (the '952 reference) as stated in the Office Action. Based upon the amendments to claims 18 and 24 Applicant respectfully submits that the cited prior art reference neither teaches nor suggests the elements of the Applicant's invention.

Specifically, the '952 reference does not teach attaching the clamp arm directly to the blade. Rather, the '952 reference teaches a moveable part 12 (the clamp arm) that directly connects with an elastic member 13, which in turn directly connects with a coupled member 14, which in turn directly connects with another interface member 16, which in turn directly connects to a narrow diameter part 15 of a vibration transmission unit 11. There is no disclosure or suggestion that the moveable part 12 directly connect with vibration transmission unit 11. Reconsideration is requested.

BEST AVAILABLE COPYRejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103~~Section Under 35 U.S.C.~~

Claims 23 and 28 stand rejected as being unpatentable over the '952 reference. ~~Examiner is requested to consider the claims in view of the prior art.~~ Because of dependency and based on the previous discussions, the '952 reference does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. ~~Examiner is requested to consider the claims in view of the prior art.~~ Reconsideration ~~Examiner is requested to consider the claims in view of the prior art.~~ and suggestions ~~Examiner is requested to consider the claims in view of the prior art.~~ are requested.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that in view of the amendments and discussion, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103 have been overcome and that the invention is now patentable over the cited prior. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider all rejections and pass this case to issue.

Should any minor points remain prior to issuance of a Notice of Allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required to Account No. 10-0750/END-696/VEK.

Respectfully submitted,

Verne E. Kreger, Jr., Reg. #35231/
Verne E. Kreger, Jr.

Verne E. Kreger, Jr.
Attorney for the Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 35,231

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
513 337-3295
DATED: March 7, 2005